arXiv:1612.05619v1 [math.CV] 16 Dec 2016

Weighted generalization of the Ramadanov theorem and further considerations.

by Zbigniew Pasternak-Winiarski (Warsaw)
and Paweł M. Wójcicki (Warsaw)

Abstract

We study the limit behavior of weighted Bergman kernels on a sequence of domains in a complex space $\mathbb{C}^N$, and show that under some conditions on domains and weights, weighed Bergman kernels converge uniformly on compact sets. Then we give a weighted generalization of the theorem given in [S, p. 38], highlighting some special property of the domains, on which the weighted Bergman kernels converge uniformly. Moreover we will show that convergence of weighted Bergman kernels implies this property, which will give a characterization of the domains, for which the inverse of Ramadanov's theorem holds.

1 Introduction

The Bergman kernel (see for instance [B, JP, K1, K2, Sh, SM]) has become a very important tool in geometric function theory, both in one and several complex variables. It turned out that not only classical Bergman kernel, but also weighted one can be useful. Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a bounded domain. For example (see [E]), if we denote by $\Pi : L^2(D) \to L^2_H(D)$ (the Bergman projection), we may define for any $\psi \in L^\infty(D)$, the Toeplitz operator T_ψ as a (bounded linear) operator on $L^2_H(D)$ by $T_\psi f := \Pi(\psi f)$. In particular, for $\psi > 0$ on D we have that T_ψ is positive definite (so injective), so there exists an inverse T_ψ^{-1}. Taking positive continuous weight function $\mu \in L^\infty(D)$, T_μ extends to a bounded operator from $L^2_H(D, \mu)$ into $L^2_H(D)$, and $K_{D,\mu}(\cdot, x) = T_\mu^{-1} K_D(\cdot, x)$, where $K_{D,\mu}(\cdot, x)$ denotes the weighted Bergman kernel (associated to weighted Bergman space $L^2_H(D,\, \mu)$)

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 32A36; Secondary 32A25.
Key words and phrases: Weighted Bergman kernel; Admissible weight; Sequence of domains.

at $x \in D$. Another practical application of weighted Bergman kernel may bo found in quantum theory (see [E1] and [O], and [PW])- we may consider a Kähler manifold Ω as a classical phase space of a physical system (many leading quantized classical systems have such a phase space). The Hilbert space H of quantum states of such a system consists of the holomorphic sections of some Hermitian line bundle E over Ω, which belong to $L^2(\Omega,\, \mu)$ (for the Liouville measure μ on Ω). One of the most interesting and important objects of this model is the reproducing kernel K of H (that is the kernel $K_{\Omega,\,\mu}$). This kernel makes the quantization of classical states possible as follows : one can assign to any classical state $z \in \Omega$ the quantum state

$$v_z := [K(\cdot, z)/||K(\cdot, z)||] \in H.$$

Using this embedding one can calculate the transition probability amplitude from one point to another :

$$a(z, w) := | < v_z|v_w > |, \quad z, w \in \Omega.$$

Then the calculation of the Feynman path integral for such a system is equivalent to finding the reproducing kernel K (that is $K_{\Omega,\,\mu}$).
But in general, it is difficult to say anything about the unweighted (regular) or weighted kernel of a given domain. One of the classic results for unweighted Bergman kernels is Ramadanov's theorem (see [R]) :

Theorem 1 (Ramadanov)**.** *Let $D_1 \Subset D_2 \Subset D_3 \ldots$ be an increasing sequence of domains and set $D := \bigcup_j D_j$. Then, $K_{D_j} \to K_D$ uniformly on compact subsets of $D \times D$.*

It is very natural to ask whether the similar theorem for weighted Bergman kernels is true. Let's recall the Forelli-Rudin construction (see [FR] and [L]) : If μ is a continuous weight on D and Ω denotes the Hartogs domain

$$\Omega = \{(z, w) \in D \times \mathbb{C}^n : ||w||^{2n} < \mu(x)\}$$

in $\mathbb{C}^{N+n}$, then

$$K_{D,\mu}(z, p) = \frac{\pi^n}{n!} K_\Omega((z, 0), (p, 0))$$

(that is the weighted Bergman kernel $K_{D,\mu}(z, p)$ of D is the restriction of the unweighted Bergman kernel $K_\Omega((z, w), (p, s))$ of Ω to the hyperplane $w = s = 0$). Thus using Ramadanov's th. for the kernels $K_{\Omega_j}((z, 0), (p, 0))$ we can derive (under some conditions on weights - monotonicity for instance) the weighted analog of this theorem. And in fact, we may find some

versions of this theorem in ([J, Prop. 3.17; Th. 3.18] for instance), but considered weights are in the special form, as a moduli of holomorphic functions or C^2 functions, or as a product of one of those with the given weight ψ. Additionally, unweighted generalization of Ramadanov th. was given in [K] (in weighted case we can't proceed similarly, since we would have to strictly restrict weights of the kernels (we would need further assumptions for instance that $\mu_{\Omega_j} \circ \Theta_j = \mu_\Omega$ for any diffeomorphism $\Theta_j : \Omega \to \Omega_j$)). We can easily see that continuity of weight μ in the Forelli-Rudin construction provides basically that Ω is an open set. In this paper we will derive a weighted version of Ramadanov's theorem for so called "admissible weights" μ (we don't require μ to be continuous) without using Forelli - Rudin construction. It is very natural to consider such kind of weights, just by their definition (see below). We will prove the inverse of this theorem as well (see also [S, p. 37] for an unweighted situation). In the second part of the paper we will show that density of holomorphic functions on a considered domain is very related to the convergence of the weighted Bergman kernels. In fact, we will get an equivalence in the unweighted case. This will provide with characterization of the domains, for which the inverse of Ramadanov's theorem holds. We shall start from the definitions and basic facts used in this paper.

2 Definitions and notations

Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a domain, and let $W(D)$ be the set of weights on D, i.e., $W(D)$ is the set of all Lebesque measurable, real - valued, positive functions on D (we consider two weights as equivalent if they are equal almost everywhere with respect to the Lebesque measure on D). If $\mu \in W(D)$, we denote by $L^2(D,\mu)$ the space of all Lebesque measurable, complex-valued, μ-square integrable functions on D, equipped with the norm $||\cdot||_{D,\mu} := ||\cdot||_\mu$ given by the scalar product

$$< f|g >_\mu := \int_D f(z)\overline{g(z)}\mu(z)dV, \quad f,g \in L^2(D,\mu).$$

The space $L^2_H(D,\mu) = H(D) \cap L^2(D,\mu)$ is called the **weighted Bergman space**, where $H(D)$ stands the space of all holomorphic functions on the domain D. For any $z \in D$ we define the evaluation functional E_z on $L^2_H(D,\mu)$ by the formula

$$E_z f := f(z), \quad f \in L^2_H(D,\mu).$$

Let us recall the definition [Def. 2.1] of admissible weight given in [PW1].

Definition 2 (Admissible weight)**.** A weight $\mu \in W(D)$ is called an *admissible weight* , an a-weight for short, if $L^2_H(D,\mu)$ is a closed subspace of $L^2(D,\mu)$ and for any $z \in D$ the evaluation functional E_z is continuous on $L^2_H(D,\mu)$. The set of all a-weights on D will be denoted by $AW(D)$.

The definition of admissible weight provides us basically with existence and uniqueness of related Bergman kernel and completeness of the space $L^2_H(D,\mu)$. In [PW] the concept of a-weight was introduced, and in [PW1] several theorems concerning admissible weights are given. An illustrative one is :

Theorem 3. *[PW1, Cor. 3.1] Let $\mu \in W(D)$. If the function μ^{-a} is locally integrable on D for some $a > 0$ then $\mu \in AW(D)$.*

Now, let 's fix a point $t \in D$ and minimize the norm $||f||_\mu$ in the class $E_t = \{f \in L^2_H(D,\mu); f(t) = 1\}$. It can be proved in a similar way as in the classical case, that if μ is an admissible weight then there exists exactly one function minimizing the norm. Let us denote it by $\phi_\mu(z,t)$. **Weigted Bergman kernel function** $K_{D,\mu}$ is defined as follows :

$$K_{D,\mu}(z,t) = \frac{\phi_\mu(z,t)}{||\phi_\mu||^2_\mu}.$$

3 Variations on the Ramadanov theorem and domain dependence.

In this section we study the limit behavior of weighted Bergman kernels for admissible weights. Moreover we give a weighted characterization of the Bergman kernel (see also [S, p. 36]) by means of which we prove kind of converse of Ramadanov theorem. We show that density of holomorphic functions is very related to the convergence of weighted Bergman kernels, and in the case of $\mu_n \equiv 1$ we even have an equivalence (see also [SI]).

3.1 Weighted generalization of the Ramadanov theorem

Main Theorem 4 (Weighted generalization of the Ramadanov theorem)**.** *Let $\{D_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of domains in $\mathbb{C}^N$ and set $D := \bigcup_j D_j$. Let $\mu \in AW(D), \mu_k \in AW(D_k)$ (extend μ_k by μ on D). Assume moreover that*

a) For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $N = N(n)$ s.t. $D_n \subset D_m$ and $\mu_n(z) \leq \mu_m(z) \leq \mu(z)$ for $m \geq N(n),\ z \in D_n$.

b) $\mu_k \xrightarrow[k\to\infty]{} \mu$ *pointwise a.e. on* D.

Then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} K_{D_k,\mu_k} = K_{D,\mu}$$

locally uniformly on $D \times D$.

The first step in the proof is to show the monotonicity property for the weighted kernels. Then we should check that the limit of the sequence of weighted kernels of the domains D_n, if exists, is equal to $K_{D,\mu}$.

Lemma 5 (Monotonicity property)**.** *For any* $n \in \mathbb{N},\ t \in D_n$ *the inequality* $K_{D_n,\mu_n}(t,t) \geq K_{D_m,\mu_m}(t,t)$ *holds for* $m \geq N(n)$.

Proof. Let us fix $n \in \mathbb{N},\ t \in D_n$. Let $m \geq N(n)$. The inequality in the statement of the lemma is true if $K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(t,t) = 0$. Then suppose that $K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(t,t) > 0$. In the proof we will use the simple remark that

$$\frac{1}{K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(t,t)} = \int_{D_n} \left| \frac{K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(s,t)}{K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(t,t)} \right|^2 \mu_n(s)dV$$

since $K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(t,t) > 0$ and

$$K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(t,t) = \int_{D_n} \overline{K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(z,t)} K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(z,t)\mu_n(z)dV$$

by the reproducing property ([PW]) for $f(\cdot) = K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(\cdot,t)$. Moreover the term $\dfrac{K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(\cdot,t)}{K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(t,t)}$ is the only element in the class $\{f \in L^2_H(D_n,\mu_n), f(t) = 1\}$ with the minimal norm. Thus for $m \geq N(n)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(t,t)} &\leq \int_{D_n} \left| \frac{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(s,t)}{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(t,t)} \right|^2 \mu_n(s)dV \\
&\leq \int_{D_n} \left| \frac{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(s,t)}{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(t,t)} \right|^2 \mu_m(s)dV \\
&\leq \int_{D_m} \left| \frac{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(s,t)}{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(t,t)} \right|^2 \mu_m(s)dV = \frac{1}{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(t,t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 6. One can show similarly that $K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(t,t) \geq K_{D,\,\mu}(t,t)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 7 (Uniqueness of the limit)**.** *If* $\lim_{n\to\infty} K_{D_n,\mu_n} = k$ *locally uniformly on* $D \times D$*, then* $k = K_{D,\mu}$.

Proof. Since the sequence (K_{D_n,μ_n}) converges locally uniformly on $D \times D$ and any function K_{D_n,μ_n} is continuous we obtain that k is continuous on $D \times D$. Let's recall that

$$\int_{D_m} \overline{K_{D_m,\mu_m}(z,t)} K_{D_m,\mu_m}(z,t)\mu_m(z)dV = K_{D_m,\mu_m}(t,t). \tag{1}$$

Fix a compact set $E \subset D$, and $t \in E$. For m large enough $E \subset D_m$ and $t \in D_m$. By Fatou's lemma

$$\begin{aligned}\int_E |k(z,t)|^2\mu(z)dV &\le \liminf_{m\to\infty} \int_E |K_{D_m,\mu_m}(z,t)|^2\mu_m(z)dV \\ &\le \liminf_{m\to\infty} \int_{D_m} |K_{D_m,\mu_m}(z,t)|^2\mu_m(z)dV \\ &= \liminf_{m\to\infty} K_{D_m,\mu_m}(t,t) = k(t,t).\end{aligned}$$

Since E is an arbitrary compact set,

$$\int_D |k(z,t)|^2\mu(z)dV \le k(t,t). \tag{2}$$

By Weierstrass theorem $k(\cdot,t) \in H(D)$, so $k(\cdot,t) \in L^2_H(D,\mu)$.
By Lemma 5 we get

$$K_{D_n,\mu_n}(t,t) \ge K_{D,\mu}(t,t)$$

for $n = 1, 2, \ldots, \quad t \in D$. In the limit $n \to \infty$ we obtain

$$k(t,t) \ge K_{D,\mu}(t,t).$$

It suffices to show that $k(z,t) = K_{D,\mu}(z,t)$. We should consider two cases :

1. $K_{D,\mu}(t,t) = 0$, for some $t \in D$.

Then for $z \in D$, $K_{D,\mu}(z,t) = 0$ since $K_{D,\mu}(t,t) = \int_D |K_{D,\mu}(z,t)|^2\mu(z)dV$, and $K_{D,\mu}$ is continuous with respect to z. Thus for any $f \in L^2_H(D,\mu)$

$$f(t) = \int_D f(w)K_{D,\mu}(t,w)\mu(w)dV = 0$$

and we have that $k(t,t)=0$, since $f(\cdot):=k(\cdot,t)\in L^2_H(D,\,\mu)$.
But $\int_D |k(z,t)|^2\mu(z)dV\le k(t,t)$, so $k(z,t)=0$, for $z\in D$.

2. $K_{D,\,\mu}(t,t)>0$, for some $t\in D$.

Then $k(t,t)>0$, since $k(t,t)\ge K_{D,\,\mu}(t,t)>0$. We will use once more the well known fact, that in the set $\{f\in L^2_H(D,\mu), f(t)=1\}$ (for some fixed $t\in D$) function $\dfrac{K_{D,\,\mu}(\cdot,t)}{K_{D,\,\mu}(t,t)}$ is the only minimal element. It is easy to see, that $\dfrac{k(\cdot,t)}{k(t,t)}$ belongs to this set (since $k(\cdot,t)\in L^2_H(D,\mu)$) and moreover by (2) $||k(\cdot,t)||_\mu\le\sqrt{k(t,t)}$.
Thus

$$\left|\left|\frac{k(\cdot,t)}{k(t,t)}\right|\right|_\mu\le\frac{\sqrt{k(t,t)}}{k(t,t)}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{k(t,t)}}\le\frac{1}{\sqrt{K_{D,\,\mu}(t,t)}}$$

$$=\left|\left|\frac{K_{D,\,\mu}(\cdot,t)}{K_{D,\,\mu}(t,t)}\right|\right|_\mu.$$

By the minimality property of $\dfrac{K_{D,\,\mu}(\cdot,t)}{K_{D,\,\mu}(t,t)}$ we get from the above, that :

$$\left|\left|\frac{k(\cdot,t)}{k(t,t)}\right|\right|_\mu=\frac{1}{\sqrt{k(t,t)}}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{K_{D,\,\mu}(t,t)}}=\left|\left|\frac{K_{D,\,\mu}(\cdot,t)}{K_{D,\,\mu}(t,t)}\right|\right|_\mu.$$

So $k(t,t)=K_{D,\,\mu}(t,t)$, and $k(z,t)=K_{D,\,\mu}(z,t)$ for $z,t\in D$. □

Proof of the main theorem. We will show that for $n\in\mathbb{N}$ the sequence $\{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}\}_{m\ge N(n)}$ is locally bounded on $D_n\times D_n$.
Using well known version of Schwarz inequality for reproducing kernels and Lemma 5 we obtain for any $z,t\in D_n$.

$$|K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(z,t)|\le\sqrt{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(z,z)}\sqrt{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(t,t)}$$

$$\le\sqrt{K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(z,z)}\sqrt{K_{D_n,\,\mu_n}(t,t)},\quad m\ge N(n).$$

The term in the right hand side of the estimation above is locally bounded on $D_n\times D_n$. By Montel's property, any subsequence of $\{K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}\}$ has a subsequence convergent locally uniformly on $D\times D$. By Lemma 7 the limit does not depend on a subsequence and is identically equal to $K_{D,\,\mu}$. Thus

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(z,t)=K_{D,\,\mu}(z,t)$$

locally uniformly on $D\times D$. □

Remark 8. Look that the case of increasing sequence of domains is a subcase of the Main Theorem 4 (see [SM] for the very interesting considerations, and unweighted kind of Lemma 7).

3.2 Characterization of the weighted Bergman kernel and further remarks on "decreasing-like" sequence of domains

In [S, p. 36] some characterization lemma for unweighted Bergman kernels is given. One can easily conclude similar one for weighted Bergman kernels, as the following Lemma 9 shows. The proof is attached only for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 9. *Denote by $S_{\mu,t} \subset L^2_H(D,\mu)$ the set of all functions f such that $f(t) \geq 0$ and $||f||_\mu \leq \sqrt{f(t)}$, where $t \in D$ is fixed. Then the weighted Bergman function $\varphi_{\mu,t}(\cdot) := K_{D,\mu}(\cdot,t)$ is uniquelly characterized by the properties :*

(i) $\varphi_{\mu,t} \in S_{\mu,t}$

(ii) if $f \in S_{\mu,t}$ *and* $f(t) \geq \varphi_{\mu,t}(t)$, *then* $f \equiv \varphi_{\mu,t}$.

Proof. One can easily see, that there exists at most one element $\varphi_{\mu,t} \in L^2_H(D,\mu)$ which satisfies (i) and (ii) (if φ_1, φ_2 satisfies (i) and (ii), then both $\varphi_1(t)$ and $\varphi_2(t)$ are nonnegative, and either $\varphi_1(t) \geq \varphi_2(t)$ and then $\varphi_1 \equiv \varphi_2$ or $\varphi_2(t) \geq \varphi_1(t)$ and then $\varphi_2 \equiv \varphi_1$). We shall show $\varphi_{\mu,t}(\cdot) = K_{D,\mu}(\cdot,t)$ has both properties.
We have

$$\varphi_{\mu,t}(t) = K_{D,\mu}(t,t) \geq 0$$

and

$$||K_{D,\mu}(\cdot,t)||^2_\mu = K_{D,\mu}(t,t)$$

(see (1)). Now let $f \in S_{\mu,t}$. If $f(t) = 0$, then $\varphi_{\mu,t}(t) = 0$. Hence $||f||_\mu = ||\varphi_{\mu,t}||_\mu = 0$, so $f \equiv 0 \equiv \varphi_{\mu,t}$.
Assume now $f(t) > 0$. By the definition of weighted Bergman kernel function $\dfrac{\varphi_{\mu,t}(\cdot)}{\varphi_{\mu,t}(t)}$ is uniquely characterized as an element in the set $\{h \in L^2_H(D,\mu), h(t) = 1\}$ with the minimal norm. But $\dfrac{f(\cdot)}{f(t)}$ belongs to this set as well, moreover

$$\left\| \frac{f(\cdot)}{f(t)} \right\|_\mu = \frac{||f||_\mu}{\sqrt{f(t)}\sqrt{f(t)}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{f(t)}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varphi_{\mu,t}(t)}} = \left\| \frac{\varphi_{\mu,t}(\cdot)}{\varphi_{\mu,t}(t)} \right\|_\mu .$$

Thus (by minimality)

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{f(t)}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varphi_{\mu,t}(t)}}$$

and for any $z \in D$

$$\frac{f(z)}{f(t)} = \frac{\varphi_{\mu,t}(z)}{\varphi_{\mu,t}(t)}.$$

So $f \equiv \varphi_{\mu,t}$. □

Let's assume that $D = \mathrm{int}(\overline{D})$ to exclude slit domains from our considerations (a disc with one radius removed for instance) and consider "decreasing - like" version of the Ramadanov th. Let us recall the definition of "approximation from outside" given in [S, Def. V.6; p. 38].

Definition 10. We say that a sequence of domains $\{D_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ approximates D from outside if $D \subset D_n$ for all n and for each open G such that $\overline{D} \subset G$ the inclusion $D \subset D_m \Subset G$ holds for all sufficiently large m.

Main Theorem 11. *Let $\{D_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of domains in $\mathbb{C}^N$ which approximates D from outside and $\mu \in AW(D), \mu_k \in AW(D_k)$ (extend μ_k by μ_n on D_n for $k \geq n$, and μ by μ_n on D_n). Assume moreover that*

a) $\mu(z) \leq \mu_m(z) \quad$ *for* $\quad m \in \mathbb{N},\ z \in D.$

b) $\mu_k \xrightarrow[k\to\infty]{} \mu$ *pointwise a.e. on* D.

Then $\{K_{D_m,\mu_m}\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ converges to $K_{D,\mu}$ locally uniformly on $D \times D$ iff for any fixed $t \in D$

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} K_{D_m,\mu_m}(t,t) = K_{D,\mu}(t,t).$$

Proof. We shall only make sure, that the converse implication is true, since the necessity is obvious. Let $F \subset D$ be a compact set. Then there is a constant $M = M(F)$ such that $\max_{z\in F} |K_{D,\mu}(z,z)| \leq M$. By Schwarz inequality

$$|K_{D_m,\mu_m}(z,t)| \leq \sqrt{K_{D_m,\mu_m}(z,z)}\sqrt{K_{D_m,\mu_m}(t,t)}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{K_{D,\mu}(z,z)}\sqrt{K_{D,\mu}(t,t)} \leq M.$$

for any z, $t \in F$. Thus $\{K_{D_m,\mu_m}\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is a Montel family on $D \times D$. It suffices to show that every convergent subsequence of this family converges to $K_{D,\mu}$.

With no loss of generality let us consider $\{K_{D_m,\mu_m}\}$ itself and assume that it does converge to some k. For $t \in D$, by Fatou's lemma

$$\begin{aligned}\int_F |k(z,t)|^2\mu(z)dV &\leq \liminf_{m\to\infty} \int_F |K_{D_m,\mu_m}(z,t)|^2\mu_m(z)dV \\ &\leq \liminf_{m\to\infty} \int_{D_m} |K_{D_m,\mu_m}(z,t)|^2\mu_m(z)dV \\ &= \liminf_{m\to\infty} K_{D_m,\mu_m}(t,t) = K_{D,\mu}(t,t) = k(t,t).\end{aligned}$$

Since $F \subset D$ is an arbitrary compact set,

$$||k(\cdot,t)||^2_\mu \leq k(t,t) = K_{D,\mu}(t,t) < \infty.$$

Thus taking in Lemma 9 $f(\cdot) = k(\cdot,t)$ we obtain $K_{D,\mu}(z,t) = k(z,t)$ for any z, $t \in D$. □

Remark 12. Look that decreasing sequence of domains satisfies assumptions of the Main Theorem 11. This theorem for classical Bergman kernels and decreasing case of domains could be found in [S, p. 37]. Main Theorem 4 could be proved in the same fashion using Lemma 9 (look in [W]).

3.3 Domain dependence

In this paragraph, among others, we will give a generalization of [S, p. 38] for weighted Bergman kernels. Moreover we will show that the converse of this theorem holds as well. We shall start with notation used in this paragraph. The first thing is to extend the weights outside its natural domain (the domain may intersect). Let $\{D_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be an approximating sequence for D. Let $\mu_n \in AW(D_n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for $k \geq 2$ we define :

$$\widetilde{\mu_k(z)} = \begin{cases} \mu_k(z) & \text{for } z \in D_k \\ \widetilde{\mu_{k-1}(z)} & \text{for } z \in D_1 \cup \ldots \cup D_{k-1} \setminus D_k \end{cases}$$

See that $\widetilde{\mu_k(z)}$ is well defined on $D_1 \cup \ldots \cup D_k$. For example

$$\widetilde{\mu_3(z)} = \begin{cases} \mu_3(z) & \text{for } z \in D_3 \\ \widetilde{\mu_2(z)} & \text{for } z \in D_1 \cup D_2 \setminus D_3 \end{cases} = \begin{cases} \mu_3(z) & \text{for } z \in D_3 \\ \mu_2(z) & \text{for } z \in D_2 \setminus D_3 \\ \mu_1(z) & \text{for } z \in (D_1 \setminus D_2) \setminus D_3 \end{cases}$$

We will now define the extension of $\mu(z)$ outside D. Since $\{D_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is an approximating sequence for D then for large $s \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $D \subset D_s \Subset D_1$. We define

$$\widetilde{\mu(z)} = \begin{cases} \mu_1(z) & \text{for } z \in D_1 \\ \mu_2(z) & \text{for } z \in D_2 \setminus D_1 \\ \mu_3(z) & \text{for } z \in D_3 \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2) \\ \dots & \\ \mu_{s-1}(z) & \text{for } z \in D_{s-1} \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2 \dots \cup D_{s-2}) \end{cases}$$

Let $E \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be Lebesque measurable, μ be a-weight on E (we set that $\mu \in AW(E)$ if for some open set $W \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ s.t. $E \subset W$ there is $\nu \in AW(W)$ s.t. $\nu_{|E} = \mu$) and $L^2(E, \mu)$ be the Hilbert space of all complex-valued functions which are square $\mu-$ integrable on a set E and holomorphic in the interior of E. Let's moreover $H(E, \mu)$ be the subset of $L^2(E, \mu)$ consisting of all functions possessing holomorphic extension to an open neighborhood of E. We will need the following :

Property 13. *$H(E, \mu)$ is dense in $L^2(E, \mu)$.*

Main Theorem 14. *Suppose that $\overline{D}$ has Property 13, and a sequence D_m approximates D from outside. Let $\mu \in AW(\overline{D}), \mu_k \in AW(D_k)$ (extend μ_k and μ_n as mentioned above). Assume moreover, that for some $p \in \mathbb{N}$*

a) $\mu(z) \leq \mu_m(z) \leq \mu_p(z)$ for $p \leq m$ and $z \in D_p$

b) $\mu_p \in L^1(D_p)$

c) $\mu_k \xrightarrow[k\to\infty]{} \mu$ pointwise a.e. in D_p

Then

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} K_{D_m,\mu_m} = K_{D,\mu}$$

locally uniformly on $D \times D$.

Proof. Let $t \in D$ and $f \in L^2_H(D, \mu)$ be fixed. We can extend f by 0 on ∂D, to provide $f \in L^2(\overline{D}, \mu)$. Consider any $h \in H(\overline{D}, \mu)$. Then for m large

enough, $h \in L^2_H(D_m, \mu_m)$ (because of b)). We have

$$|h(t)| = \left| \int_{D_m} h(z) K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(z,t) \mu_m(z) dV \right|$$

$$= \left| \int_{D_m} h(z) \mu_m(z)^{1/2} K_{D_m,\,\mu_m}(z,t) \mu_m(z)^{1/2} dV \right|$$

$$\leq ||h||_{\mu_m} \left(\int_{D_m} |K_{D_m,\mu_m}(z,t)|^2 \mu_m(z) dV \right)^{1/2}$$

$$= ||h||_{\mu_m} K_{D_m,\mu_m}(t,t)^{1/2}.$$

In the limit $m \to \infty$ we get (by Domin. Conv. Th.) $|h(t)| \leq k(t,t)^{1/2} ||h||_{E,\mu}$, where $k(t,t) = \lim\limits_{m\to\infty} K_{D_m,\mu_m}(t,t)$. By density Property 13 there is a sequence $\{h_m\}$ of functions in $H(\overline{D}, \mu)$ such that $h_m \xrightarrow{L^2(\overline{D},\mu)} f$ (thus locally uniformly on D). So

$$|f(t)| \leq k(t,t)^{1/2} ||f||_{\overline{D},\mu} = k(t,t)^{1/2} ||f||_{D,\mu}.$$

So for $f(t) = K_{D,\mu}(t,t)$ we have

$$|K_{D,\mu}(t,t)| = K_{D,\mu}(t,t) \leq k(t,t)^{1/2} ||K_{D,\mu}||_\mu = k(t,t)^{1/2} K_{D,\mu}(t,t)^{1/2}.$$

Thus $K_{D,\mu}(t,t) \leq k(t,t)$. Obviously $K_{D_m,\mu_m}(t,t) \leq K_{D,\mu}(t,t)$. In the limit $m \to \infty$ we get $k(t,t) \leq K_{D,\mu}(t,t)$. Therefore

$$K_{D,\mu}(t,t) = k(t,t) = \lim_{m\to\infty} K_{D_m,\mu_m}(t,t).$$

The hypothesis follows from the Main Theorem 11. □

What is interesting, it turns out that some kind of the converse of Main Theorem 14 holds as well, namely :

Main Theorem 15. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a domain and let μ be a weight on the closure $\overline{D}$ of D in $\mathbb{C}^N$ s.t. the measure of the boundary ∂D given by μ is equal to 0 and $\mu_{|D} \in AW(D)$. Suppose that for some sequence $\{D_n\}$ approximating D from outside, and some sequence of admissible weights $\{\mu_n\}$ (where $\mu_n \in AW(D_n)$)*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} K_{D_n,\mu_{n|D}} = K_{D,\mu}$$

holds locally uniformly on $D \times D$; for any $t \in D, K_{D_n,\mu_n}(\cdot,t) \in L^2_H(D,\mu)$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} ||K_{D_n,\mu_n}(\cdot,t)||^2_\mu = ||K_{D,\mu}(\cdot,t)||^2_\mu = K_{D,\mu}(t,t).$$

Then Property 13 holds.

Proof. For any $t \in D$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&||K_{D_n,\mu_n|D}(\cdot,t) - K_{D,\mu}(\cdot,t)||^2_\mu \\
&= \int_D (K_{D_n,\mu_n}(z,t) - K_{D,\mu}(z,t))\overline{(K_{D_n,\mu_n}(z,t) - K_{D,\mu}(z,t))}\mu(z)dV \\
&= \int_D |K_{D_n,\mu_n}(z,t)|^2\mu(z)dV - \int_D K_{D,\mu}(t,z)K_{D_n,\mu_n}(z,t)\mu(z)dV \\
&- \overline{\int_D K_{D,\mu}(t,z)K_{D_n,\mu_n}(z,t)\mu(z)dV} + \int_D |K_{D,\mu}(z,t)|^2\mu(z)dV \\
&= ||K_{D_n,\mu_n}(\cdot,t)||^2_\mu - K_{D_n,\mu_n}(t,t) - \overline{K_{D_n,\mu_n}(t,t)} + K_{D,\mu}(t,t) \\
&= ||K_{D_n,\mu_n}(\cdot,t)||^2_\mu - 2K_{D_n,\mu_n}(t,t) + K_{D,\mu}(t,t).
\end{aligned}
$$

By assumptions

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} ||K_{D_n,\mu_n|D}(\cdot,t) - K_{D,\mu}(\cdot,t)||^2_\mu = 0.$$

which means that the closure in L^2- norm

$$cl\{K_{D,\mu}(\cdot,t), t \in D\} \subset cl\{K_{D_n,\mu_n}(\cdot,t), t \in D, n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset L^2_H(\overline{D},\mu).$$

On the other hand, by reproducing property ([PW])

$$cl\{K_{D,\mu}(\cdot,t), t \in D\} = L^2_H(D,\mu) = L^2_H(\overline{D},\mu).$$

Taking into account that

$$\{K_{D_n,\mu_n}(\cdot,t), t \in D, n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset H(\overline{D},\mu)$$

we obtain desired result. □

Remark 16. Look also in [SI] for some considerations concerning unweighted, decreasing case of Main Thm. 15 and very interesting remarks. Look that taking for any n, $\mu_n \equiv 1$ we get in fact that Property 13 and hypothesis of the Main Theorem 14 are equivalent, which gives us a description of the domains, for which "decresing-like" version of Ramadanov theorem holds. Moreover, using Main Theorem 4 we can prove a weighted version of counterexample to the Lu Qi-Keng conjecture given in [Bs].

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to Prof. Harold Boas for his very helpful advices on the Main Theorem 4 and other suggestions. We would like to express our thanks to Prof. Maciej Skwarczyński (†) for his passion and a great book for students, and his contribution to the theory of Bergman kernels. We would like to thank our families for supporting us through their presence.

References

[B] S. Bergman, *The kernel function and conformal mapping*, A.M.S. Survey Number V, 2^{nd} Edition, 1970.

[Bs] H.P. Boas, *Counterexample to the Lu Qi-Keng conjecture*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 97 (1986), no. 2, 374–375.

[E] M. Engliš, *Toeplitz operators and weighted Bergman kernels*, J. Funct. Anal. 255 (2008), no. 6, 1419–1457.

[E1] M. Engliš, *Weighted Bergman kernels and quantization*, Comm. Math. Phys. 227 (2002), no. 2, 211–241.

[FR] F. Forelli, W. Rudin, *Projections on spaces of holomorphic functions in balls*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 24 (1974/75), 593–602.

[J] R.L.Jacobson, *Weighted Bergman Kernel Functions and the Lu Qi-keng Problem*, Thesis (Ph.D.)–Texas A&M University, 2012.

[JP] M.Jarnicki, P.Pflug, *Invariant Distances and Metrics in Complex Analysis*, De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics 9, (2013).

[K] S.G. Krantz, *A new proof and a generalization of Ramadanov's theorem*, Complex Variables and Elliptic Equations, 51, No. 12, (2006), 1125–1128.

[K1] S. G. Krantz, *Function Theory of Several Complex Variables* , (AMS Chelsea Publishing), 2001.

[K2] S.G. Krantz, *Geometric analysis of the Bergman kernel and metric*, (New York [etc.] : Springer), 2013.

[L] E. Ligocka, *On the Forelli-Rudin construction and weighted Bergman projections.*, Studia Math. 94 (1989), no. 3, 257–272.

[O] A. Odzijewicz, *On reproducing kernels and quantization of states*, Comm. Math. Phys. 114 (1988), 577–597.

[PW] Z. Pasternak-Winiarski, *On the Dependence of the Reproducing Kernel on the Weight of Integration*, J. Funct. Anal., 94, No. 1 (1990), 110–134.

[PW1] Z. Pasternak-Winiarski, *On weights which admit the reproducing kernel of Bergman type*, Internat. J. Math & Math. Sci., 15, No. 1 (1992), 1–14.

[R] I. Ramadanov, *Sur une propriété de la fonction de Bergman.*, (French) C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci. 20 (1967) 759–762.

[Sh] B.V. Shabat, *Introduction to Complex Analysis, Part II : Functions of Several Variables*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Volume 110 (1992), A.M.S.

[SM] M. Skwarczyński, T. Mazur, *Wstepne twierdzenia teorii funkcji wielu zmiennych zespolonych*, wyd. Krzysztof Biesaga, Warszawa, 2001.

[SI] M. Skwarczyński, T. Iwiński, *The convergence of Bergman functions for a decreasing sequence of domains*, Approximation theory (Proc. Conf., Inst. Math., Adam Mickiewicz Univ., Poznañ, 1972), pp. 117–120. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1975.

[S] M. Skwarczyński, *Biholomorphic invariants related to the Bergman function*, Dissertationes Mathematicae (Rozprawy Matematyczne) 173 (1980), Warsaw, Polish Scientific Publishing Company.

[W] P.M. Wójcicki, Weighted Bergman kernel function, admissible weights and the Ramadanov theorem, *Matematychni Studii* 42, no. 2, (2014) 160–164.

Zbigniew Pasternak-Winiarski
Faculty of Mathematics and Information Science
Warsaw University of Technology
Koszykowa 75, 00-662 Warsaw, Poland
E-mail: z.pasternak-winiarski@mini.pw.edu.pl

Paweł M. Wójcicki
Faculty of Mathematics and Information Science

Warsaw University of Technology
Koszykowa 75, 00-662 Warsaw, Poland
E-mail: p.wojcicki@mini.pw.edu.pl